REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of October 7, 2004, has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-10, 12-16, and 18-22 are now pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 13, 16, and 20 are amended, and claim 17 is canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Claim 16 is amended only to incorporate all of the features recited in now-canceled dependent claim 17.

Claims 1, 6-10, 16, 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,372 to Hughes ("Hughes") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,279,043 to Hayward et al. ("Hayward"). Claims 5, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Hayward, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lection et al. ("Lection"). Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Hayward, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 to Chen et al. ("Chen"). Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lection.

Claim 16 is directed to a method for creating data at a source location to transmit to a destination location. As amended to fully incorporate now-canceled dependent claim 17, the method of claim 16 includes generating a software envelope containing a data file and a plugin object.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's detailed explanation of her position on pp. 2-5 of the Office Action. However, it is unclear whether the Examiner believes that Hughes discloses a plugin object. On the one hand, the Examiner relies on Hayward to teach the plugin object missing from Hughes. But on pp. 4 and 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner attempts to compare the claimed plugin object with either the template tag or the template of Hughes. With all due respect, Hughes

either teaches the claimed plugin object or it does not. It appears that the Examiner recognizes that Hughes does not teach or suggest a plugin object, since the Examiner has attempted to rely upon Hayward to teach this feature missing from Hughes.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 17 (now rewritten into claim 16) is internally inconsistent with the Examiner's own position by asserting that Hughes discloses generating a software envelope containing the claimed plugin object. This is simply untrue. Taking for the moment (but not necessarily adopting) the Examiner's understanding of a plugin object as being "a small software application used to add features to a larger system" (Office Action, p. 3), the Examiner's later comparison of a plugin object with Hughes's template (or template tag) is incompatible. Hughes's template is *not* a software application; it is data.

In any event, the rejection of claim 17 (again, now part of claim 16) is also in error because the template and template tags of Hughes are simply not plugin objects. Again, the template and template tag of Hughes are themselves mere data for use by a software application.

Moreover, neither Hughes nor Hayward, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests that a plugin object is *included* in the transmitted software envelope as claimed. Even taking into account the Office Action's reliance on plugins taught by Hayward, there is nothing the prior art that would have motivated one to take the plugin of Hayward and place it in an envelope in Hughes as proposed in the Office Action.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that independent claim 16 is allowable over both Hughes and Hayward, either alone or in combination.

Independent claims 1 and 20 are also allowable over Hughes in view of Hayward for at least similar reason as those discussed above with regard to claim 16, and further in view of the differing features recited therein.

8

Claims 2-10, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are also allowable for at least those reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Moreover, none of Lection, Hughes, Hayward, and Chen, either alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features recited in their respective independent claims.

Independent claim 12 is directed to a computer readable medium having stored thereon a data structure. As amended, the data structure of claim 12 includes a plugin object configured to create an object from a data file in accordance with a predetermined schema. Lection simply fails to teach or suggest this feature of amended claim 12. Accordingly, it is submitted that amended claim 12 is allowable over Lection.

Claims 13-15 are also allowable for at least those reasons that claim 12 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Moreover, the proposed addition of Lection and Chen, fails to make up for the deficiencies in the references asserted in rejecting their respective independent claims.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner believe that an interview would be desirable, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 21, 2004

Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001